

REMARKS

Status of the Claims

Claims 3 and 15-23 are pending with Claims 3 and 18 being independent. Claims 3 and 15-21 have been amended. Support for the claim changes can be found in the original disclosure, for example, at least in Fig. 29 and the accompanying disclosure, and at page 26, line 19 through page 27, line 3 and at page 29, line 20 through page 31, line 12 of the specification. Therefore no new matter has been added.

Requested Action

Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the outstanding rejections in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claim Rejections

Claims 3 and 15-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0008360 (Ankrum et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,389,241 (Cernusak et al.) and U.S. Patent No. 7,062,579 (Tateyama et al.). Claims 22 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ankrum et al., Cernusak et al., Tateyama et al., and U.S. Patent No. 6,000,864 (Hanada).

In response, while not conceding the propriety of the rejections, independent Claims 3 and 18 have been amended. Applicants submit that as amended, these claims are allowable for the following reasons.

Independent Claim 3 relates to a digital camera that can directly communicate with a printer, comprising a receiving unit that receives capability information of the printer

from the printer, the capability information including first information and second information, the first information indicating whether the printer has a first function of automatically detecting a size of paper set on the printer, and the second information indicating whether the printer has a second function of automatically detecting a type of paper set on the printer. Independent Claim 3 also recites a determination unit that (a) determines, based on the first information included in the capability information received by the receiving unit, whether the printer has the first function, and (b) determines, based on the second information included in the capability information received by the receiving unit, whether the printer has the second function. Independent Claim 3 further recites a user interface.

Claim 3 has been amended to recite that the receiving unit receives capability information of the printer from the printer, the capability information including first information and second information, the first information indicating whether or not the printer has a first function of automatically detecting a size of paper set on the printer, and the second information indicating whether or not the printer has a second function of automatically detecting a type of paper set on the printer. Claim 3 has also been amended to recite that the determination unit (a) determines, based on the first information included in the capability information received by the receiving unit, whether or not the printer has the first function, and (b) determines, based on the second information included in the capability information received by the receiving unit, whether or not the printer has the second function.

Claim 3 has been further amended to recite that the user interface (a) notifies a user that the printer has the first function if the determination unit determines that the printer has the first function and notifies the user that the printer does not have the first function if the determination unit determines that the printer does not have the first function, and (b) notifies the user that the printer has the second function if the determination unit determines that the printer has the second function and notifies the user that the printer does not have the second function if the determination unit determines that the printer does not have the second function.

In contrast, the citations to Ankrum et al., Cernusak et al., and Tateyama et al. are not understood to disclose or suggest a user interface that (a) notifies a user that the printer has the first function of automatically detecting a size of paper set on the printer, if the determination unit determines that the printer has the first function and notifies the user that the printer does not have the first function if the determination unit determines that the printer does not have the first function, and (b) notifies the user that the printer has the second function of automatically detecting a type of paper set on the printer if the determination unit determines that the printer has the second function and notifies the user that the printer does not have the second function if the determination unit determines that the printer does not have the second function, as recited by amended Claim 3. Rather, the Cernusak et al. citation is understood to disclose an image forming device 10 including automatic sensors for media type detection and automatic sensors for media size detection (see Fig. 4, col.7, lines 60-62, col.8, lines 10-11). However, the image forming device 10 of Cernusak et al. is not understood to provides to an external apparatus information indicating whether or not the printer has automatic sensors for media type detection and

information indicating whether or not the printer has the automatic sensors for media size detection. And none of the citations to Ankrum et al., Cernusak et al., and Tateyama et al. is understood to disclose that both of i) first information indicating whether or not the printer has a first function of automatically detecting a size of paper set on the printer and ii) second information indicating whether or not the printer has a second function of automatically detecting a type of paper set on the printer, is transmitted from a printer, as a part of capability information of the printer, to a digital camera. Accordingly, these citations are also not understood to disclose or suggest the receiving unit that receives such capability information, as recited by amended Claim 3, or the determination unit that provides various determinations based on this information, as also recited by amended Claim 3.

Since amended Claim 3 is understood to recite several features not disclosed or suggested by the citations to Tateyama et al. and Ankrum et al., Applicants submit that the Office has not yet satisfied its burden of proof to establish a prima facie case of obviousness against amended Claim 3. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of amended Claim 3 be withdrawn. And because corresponding method Claim 18 has been amended to recite similar features, it is submitted to be allowable for similar reasons.

The dependent claims are also submitted to be patentable, due to their dependency from the independent base claims, as well as due to additional features that are recited. Individual consideration of the dependent claims is respectfully solicited.

Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, the application is now in allowable form. Therefore, early passage to issue is respectfully solicited.

Any fee required in connection with this paper should be charged to Deposit Account No. 06-1205.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Gary M. Jacobs/

Gary M. Jacobs
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 28,861

FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO
1290 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10104-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200
GMJ/klm

FCJS_WS 5475312v1